



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,507	04/06/2000	Giampiero M. Sierra	MS1-486US	9078

22801 7590 05/23/2003
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5

Office Action Summary

Application

09/544,507

Applicant(s)

SIERRA ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,9,12,13,17,20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,9,12,13,17,20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 3/5/2003.
2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 17, 20, and 21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 11, 14-16, 18-19, and 22-24 are canceled, claims 1, 9, and 17 are amended. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As per independent claims 1, 9 and 17, the applicant claims "if conditions allow for the reception of the user input and it is determined that there has been a failure to operatively receive correct user input for the login operation". There is nowhere in the specification to describe the user's failure to enter correct user input for the login operation.

The examiner will interpret claims 1, 9 and 17 according to his best understanding; however, appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al ("Cohen", US 5,740,035) in view of Bates et al ("Bates", US 6,337,702).

As per independent claim 1, Cohen teaches a method for use in a graphical user interface configured to support a login operation, the method comprising:

displaying at least one user input field within a graphical user interface, wherein the at least one user input field is configured to operatively receive user input associated with the login operation (188 of fig. 5B);

determining when conditions allow for the reception of the user input (one condition allows for the reception of the user input is when the password prompt is displayed by the display 50; fig. 5B, col. 13, lines 48-49); and

Cohen discloses determining if conditions allow for the reception of the user input and it is determined that there has been a failure to operatively receive correct user input for the login operation, then automatically displaying reminder information associated with the user input field within the graphical user interface (192 of fig. 5B; col. 13, lines 51-54). However, Cohen does not explicitly disclose this being done through a non-modal mechanism. Bates discloses a method of displaying a user input field (146 of fig. 5) and automatically displaying reminder

Art Unit: 2174

information associated with the user input field through a non-modal mechanism (fig. 5; col. 8, lines 11-18). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Bates of displaying reminder information associated with the user input field through a non-modal mechanism in Cohen's method since it would improve Cohen's system to allow the user faster reentering of the correct login input upon the non-modal hint.

As per claims 4 and 5, which are dependent on claim 1 and 4 respectively, Cohen teaches the user input field is configured to input a password wherein the reminder information includes user provided password reminder information (fig. 5B; col. 13, lines 48-54).

As per independent claims 9 and 17, they are similar in scope to claim 1; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per 12 and 20, which are dependent on claims 9 and 17 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 4; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per 13 and 21, which are dependent on claims 12 and 20 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 5; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 09/544,507

Page 6

Art Unit: 2174

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
May 16, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100